regard the Examiner's Amendment simply repeated what had been directed by applicant's amendment of June 28, 2004. As that amendment pointed out the intent of amending the paragraph in question was to provide the antecedent basis for the claim language in Claims 6 and 18 regarding the "runout". Specifically, Claims 6 and 18 defined the runout as "$\pm$ .006". This was based upon original Claim 6 which also referred to "$\pm$ .006". Applicant's amendment, however, erroneously referred to the parameter as ".066". In addition, when underlining the added matter the minus portion of the $\pm$ was superimposed by the added underlining. Accordingly, there is concern that when the application is printed as a patent the printer will not appreciate the "minus" indication. As a result, the present amendment substitutes a replacement for the last paragraph of page 10 instead of the paragraph that was original directed by applicant's prior amendment and by the Examiner's Amendment.

Since no new matter is involved in this amendment and moreover, since the amendment is proper for the sake of accuracy it is requested that this amendment be entered.

Respectfully submitted,

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

By Harold Pezzner

Harold Pezzner
1007 N. Orange Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Reg. No. 22,112
Tel. (302) 658-9141

@PFDesktop\::ODMA/MHODMA/IMANDMS;CB;362777;1